



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CD
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/758,299	01/10/2001	David Clarke Pollock	HEM 99/607 (A-2911)	9699
7590	12/04/2003		EXAMINER	
LERNER AND GREENBERG, P.A. POST OFFICE BOX 2480 HOLLYWOOD, FL 33022-2480			PRONE, JASON D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3724	13
			DATE MAILED: 12/04/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Applicant No .	Applicant(s)
	09/758,299	POLLOCK ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jason Prone	3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 September 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,5,7-11 and 22-24 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,5,7-11 and 22-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 10 January 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because Figure 1 and 2 are both using the same symbol “ δ ”. If the Figures were separated, it would be unclear what this symbol represents. Each Figure should have its own “ δ ”. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 5, 7-11, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spengler in view of Shore et al. and Barwise et al. Spengler discloses the invention including a frame (Fig. 2), a pair of cylinders disposed opposite one another with a gap in-between (Fig. 2), that the pair of cylinders includes a first cutting cylinder (3) having a periphery (Fig. 7) with a cutting knife (9) and a second cylinder (4), a one drive rotating the first cutting cylinder (Abstract), a sub-frame (32) having a pivot point (29), that the sub-frame supports the cylinders, the one drive/first drive, and a second drive (Fig. 3), a further drive (45) connected to the sub-frame for pivoting the sub-frame about the pivot point (Fig. 3), a control unit connected to and

controlling the further drive and the one drive for controlling a rotational speed of the first cutting cylinder (Column 5 lines 40-52), a second drive rotates and mounts the second cylinder (Abstract), that the first and second drives are motors (6), and that the first and second drives are gears (7), that a component of travel of a point of contact between the cylinders in a direction of travel of the work piece matches a speed of the work piece for cutting in a straight line (Fig. 3) but fails to disclose that the cutting knife is helically about or at least one turn around the periphery of the first cutting cylinder, a sensor, connected to the control unit and disposed in the travel path of the work piece, providing control signals to the control unit for controlling operation of the cylinders and monitoring the cutting operation, that the sensors detect an unacceptable cut, and that the control unit is a microprocessor. Barwise et al. teaches a cutting knife that is helically about or at least one turn around the periphery of the first cutting cylinder (11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to have provided Spengler with a helical blade, as taught by Barwise et al., for a more precise continuous cut.

Shore et al. teaches a sensor, connected to the control unit and disposed in the travel path of the work piece, providing control signals to the control unit for controlling operation of the cylinders and monitoring the cutting operation, that the sensors detect an unacceptable cut, and that the control unit is a microprocessor (Column 1 lines 15-26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to have replaced the user input control unit of Spengler with the sensors

and control unit as taught by Shore et al. in order to provide Spengler with a more accurate and faster control of the cutting conditions.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 30 September 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In reply to applicants argument to the Shore et al. patent, Shore et al. clearly discloses a sensor that monitors^s the cutting of a work piece, that control the cutting cylinder relative to the work piece, and that is in the travel path or rolling line of the work piece (Column 1 lines 15-26). Applicant has not disclosed any structural limitations that would overcome the cited prior art. Therefore, in view of the statements above, the rejection is valid and will remain.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Prone whose telephone number is 703-605-4287. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00, Mon - (every other) Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan N. Shoap can be reached on 703-308-1082. In lieu of mailing, it is encouraged that all formal responses be faxed to 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.


JP
December 1, 2003


aey
Allan N. Shoap
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700